Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)	
Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the)	MB Docket No. 05-311
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	,	WID DOCKET NO. 03-311
Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984)	
as amended by the Cable Television)	
Consumer Protection and Competition Act)	
of 1992	Ś	

REPLY COMMENTS OF QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC.

Qwest Communications International Inc. ("Qwest'?)hereby files these reply comments in response to the Federal Communications Commission's ("Commission") *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* ("*FNPRM*") in the above-captioned docket.¹

Qwest views that some of the Commission's findings in the *Cable Franchise Order* may be applicable to renewal of incumbent franchises. Nevertheless, the Commission should recognize that there is a larger competitive playing field than just provision of cable services -- that reflected in the bundled sale of voice, data, and video services -- that should be considered in any leveling of regulatory requirements for only incumbent cable providers. Additionally, while state and local authorities are generally free to impose customer service standards that exceed federal standards, competitive entry should serve to reduce the need for such standards.

Community Media v. FCC, No. 07-3391 and cons. cases (Sixth Circuit).

.

¹ In the Matter of Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 as amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MB Docket No. 05-311,22 FCC Rcd 5101 (2007) ("FNPRM" or "Order" as appropriate), appeals pending sub nom., Alliance for

I. THE COMMISSION SHOULD CONSIDER THE BROADER COMPETITIVE MARKET FOR BUNDLED VOICE, DATA AND VIDEO SERVICES AS IT ASSESSES WHETHER TO EXTEND ITS CABLE FRANCHISE ORDER FINDINGS TO RENEWALS OF INCUMBENT FRANCHISES

In the *FNPRM* the Commission tentatively concluded that its findings in the *Order* "should apply to cable operators that have existing franchise agreements as they negotiate renewal of those agreements with LFAs [local franchising authorities]." In the *Order*, the Commission has made findings on several issues pertaining to cable franchises for the purpose of providing guidance on what actions by an LFA would constitute "an unreasonable refus[al] to award an additional competitive franchise" in violation of Section 621(a)(1). This statutory language is specific to franchise applications of potential competitors who are not currently providing video service in that area. In turn, the Commission's implementing rules and interpretive guidance in the *Order* are specific to that situation.

At the same time, to the extent that the Commission has interpreted provisions of the Communications Act that apply to any and all cable providers, such as Sections 611(a) and 622(a),⁵ then it would seem that such guidance would be applicable to any franchise negotiations, whether for initial competitive franchises or renewals of existing franchises. Thus, care must be taken to discern which rules and interpretative guidance in the *Order* should apply solely to additional competitive entrant franchises, and which should apply to all cable franchises.

² FNPRM¶ 140.

³ Order \P 64.

⁴ It would seem, however, that what constitutes an unreasonable refusal to grant a franchise for a new competitive entrant would also be an unreasonable basis to refuse to renew that competitive franchise.

⁵ See Sections 611(a) and 622(a) from the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984, Pub. L. No. 98-549, 98 Stat. 2779 (Oct. 30, 1984), as codified in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 531, 542.

Additionally, the Commission should also consider that the rules and guidance applicable to all franchises is also in concert with the existing statutory provisions regarding franchise renewals.⁶

Generally, like AT&T, Qwest has advocated to lessen regulatory requirements for incumbent service providers where competitive market conditions warrant it. Here, the purpose of the Commission's *Order* is to interpret Congress' mandate that local franchising processes not unreasonably inhibit new Competitive entry in the market for the provision of cable services. It also may be that some of fne Commission's guidance for implementing that mandate reasonably may be applied to incumbent franchises as well. It is important to note, however, that today incumbent providers of cable service are increasingly also competitive providers of voice and data communications through a variety of communication technologies. Yet, incumbent local exchange carriers ("ILECs") providing voice and data services remain subject to a myriad of asymmetrical regulatory obligations. This is particularly the case in the voice services market in spite of increasingly vigorous competition to provide service in that market and several proposals before the Commission to eliminate now unnecessary regulation on ILEC provision of those services. Given this, Qwest urges that any equalizing of the regulatory framework for cable competition should be considered in parallel with, and certainly not prior to, equalizing of the regulatory framework for voice and data services.

II. LOCAL AND STATE AUTHORITIES MAY IMPOSE THEIR OWN CUSTOMER SERVICE STANDARDS, BUT COMPETITIVE ENTRY SHOULD REDUCE THE NEED FOR SUCH STANDARDS

In the *FNPRM*, the Commission also tentatively concluded that it cannot "preempt state or local customer service laws that exceed the Commission's standards, nor . . . prevent LFAs and cable operators from agreeing to more stringent standards," based on the language of Section

3

⁶ See 47 U.S.C. § 546.

632(d)(2).⁷ Qwest agrees with Verizon's comments on this issue.' State and local authorities may impose customer service requirements on cable franchisees pertaining to the provision of cable service. Yet, those customer service requirements must be true customer service requirements specific to the provision of cable service and not attempts to regulate other aspects of a cable provider's business in the guise of customer service requirements. Qwest would also note that as there is more competitive entry into the cable delivery service market the competitive market itself should drive improved customer service and lessen, if not eliminate, the need for regulated service standards. Thus, generally, an LFA should need to rely less on customer service standards for maintaining a certain level of service quality as it grants additional Competitive franchises.

Respectfully submitted,

QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC.

By: <u>Tiffany West Smink</u>

Craig J. Brown Tiffany West Smink

Suite 950

607 14" Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005

(303) 383-6619

Its Attorneys

May 7,2007

⁷ FNPRM¶ 143.

⁸ See Comments of Verizon, MB Docket No. 05-311, dated Apr. 20,2007, pp. 2-9.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Richard Grozier, do hereby certify that I have caused the foregoing REPLY

COMMENTS OF QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC. to be:

1) filed with the FCC via its Electronic Comment Filing System in MB Docket No. 05-311; 2) served, via e-mail on Ms. Mary Beth Murphy, Media Bureau, Policy Division at

MaryBeth.Murphy@fcc.gov; 3) served, via e-mail on the FCC's duplicating contractor Best

Copy and Printing, Inc. at fcc@bcpiweb.com; and 4) served, via First Class United Stated mail, postage prepaid, on the parties listed on the attached service list.

/s/ Richard Grozier Richard Grozier

May 7,2007

Kevin Krufky Alcatel-Lucent Suite 640, West Tower 1100 New York Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20005 Christopher M. Heirnann Gary L. Phillips Paul K. Mancini AT&T Inc. Suite 1000 1120 20th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036

Mike Wassenaar Cable Access-St. Paul, Inc. d/b/a St. Paul Neighborhood Network Suite 250 375 Jackson Street St. Paul, MN 55101

Chuck Pena Fairfax Cable Access Corporation Suite S 2929 Eskridge Road Fairfax, VA 22031 Robert Brading MetroEast Community Media 829 NE 8th Street Gresham, OR 97030

Alan Bushong Capital Community Television POB 2342 Salem, OR. 97308 Bill Kucera City of Fairborn 44 West Hebble Avenue Fairborn, OH 45324

Michael C. Athay Robert A. Sutton City of Philadelphia 17th Floor 1515 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19102 DeeDee Halleck Deep Dish TV 339 Lafayette New York, NY 10012 Diana E. Agosta 180 Claremont Avenue #32 New York, NY 10027

Beverly Hacker Double Helix Corporation Suite 100 625 N. Euclid St. Louis, MO 63108 Scott Counsell Everett Community TV 484 Broadway #3 Everett, MA 02149

Mitsuko R. Herrera Allan W. Hide Michael S. Liberman Fairfax County Virginia Suite 433 12000 Government Center Parkway Fairfax, VA 22035-0045 John W. Donovan 35 Newell Road Auburndale, MA 02466 Kevin Kryzda Martin County 2401 SE Monterey Road Stuart, FL 34996

Chad S. Wachter Felix Boccucci, Jr. Knology, Inc. 1241 O.G. Skinner Drive West Point, GA 31833 Kenneth S. Fellman......GMTC Suite 900 3773 Cherry Creek North Drive Denver, CO 80209 Dan Coughlin Manhattan Neighborhood Network 537 West 59th Street New York, NY 10019

Cathy Grimes Peel Miami-Dade County Florida Suite 902 140 West Flagler Street Miami, FL 33130 Nancy L. Werner.....MHCRC
Berry, Elsner & Hammond LLP
Suite 380
1750 SW Harbor Way
Portland, OR 97201-5106

Daniel L. Brenner
Neal M. Goldberg
National Cable &
Telecommunications Association
Suite 100
25 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001-1431

Jeanne M. Fox
Frederick F. Butler
Connie O. Hughes
Joseph L. Fiordaliso
Christine Bator
New Jersey Board of Public Utilities
Two Gateway Center
Newark, NJ 07102

Daniel Mitchell
Karlen Reed
National Telecommunications
Cooperative Association
10th Floor
4121 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22203

Mitchel Ahlbaum Radhika Karrnarkar The City of New York 9th Floor 75 Park Place New York, NY 10007

Peter McGowan
John C. Graham
New York State
Department of Public Service
Three Empire State Plaza
Albany, NY 12223-1350

Nantz Rickard Public Access Corporation of the District of Columbia 901 Newton Street, N.E. Washington, DC 20017 Richard Ramlall RCN Corporation 196 Van Buren Street Herndon, VA 20170

Edward Shakin William H. Johnson Verizon Suite 500 1515 North Courthouse Road Arlington, VA 22201

Bruce S. Anderson Village of Hoffman Estates 1900 Hassell Road Hoffman Estates, IL 60169 Tony Perez City of Seattle Suite 2700 700 Fifth Avenue PO Box 94709 Seattle, WA 98124-4709

Mike Reardon City of Saint Paul 15 West Kellogg Boulevard 68 City Hall St. Paul, MN 55102 Jeff Shaw David Media Access 1623 Fifth Street Davis, CA 95616 Annie Folger Midpeninsula Community Media Center 900 San Antonio Road Palo Alto, CA 94303

Serena Ferguson Mann Howard County Government 3450 Courthouse Drive Ellicott City, MD 21043 Carl Kucharski Portland Community Media 2766 NE Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Portland, OR 97212

Zane Blaney San Francisco Community Television Corp 1720 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94102 Timothy M. Broering
Telecommunications Board of
Northern Kentucky
3414 Decoursey Avenue
Covington, KY 41015

D. Craig Martin.....wow Suite 209 259 E. Michigan Avenue Kalamazoo, MI 49007 Gary Haakenson 121- 5th Avenue North Edmonds, WA 98020

Keith Thibault Fall River Community Television 777 Elsbree Street Fall River, MA 02720 Bruce Crest
Metropolitan Area Communications Commission
Suite 6020
1815 NW 169th Place
Beaverton, OR 9'7006

Dawn Wills 302 N. Clark Street River Falls, WI 54022 Herb W. Bergson City of Duluth, Minnesota Room 403 411 West First Street Duluth, MN 55802

Chad A. Johnston The Peoples Channel 300AC South Elliott Road Chapel Hill, NC 27514 Michael Max Knobbe BronxNet Carman Hall Rm C19B Bronx, NY 10468